New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; R. H. Waldo, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	2.60
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	5.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	3.33	One month	.50
One year	6.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.79	One month	.50
One year	13.58	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

German Figures.

The assertion made in Berlin that more than a million men, two-thirds of them French, are fighting for Verdun is too palpably absurd to require discussion. The French have not 800,000, or half of 800,000, on their line at Verdun or in reserve behind. A conservative estimate of the French forces engaged and in reserve is 300,000, and the German numbers are probably about equal. Neither the French nor the Germans could munition and maintain larger forces in this sector, nor could either make use of them if they could.

When the Germans assert that they are outnumbered on the Western front, and have been for a long time, they are telling a truth which has never been disputed. Their force has been estimated as high as 1,800,000 and as low as 1,200,000; probably 1,500,000 is a fair figure. The French have steadily had at least 1,600,000 in line and the British have long had over 1,000,000. Probably the Germans had the advantage of numbers up to the end of the Battle of Flanders in November, 1914, but since then they have been heavily outnumbered.

But the most interesting portion of the German statement is found in the declaration that the French have now only 1,600,000 men left available for service. This is palpably untrue, but it reveals an interesting German calculation and throws much light on the present German numbers, because calculations of French losses made by Germans, like those of German losses made by the French, are based largely upon the losses suffered by those who make the calculation.

Let us take the German figures for French numbers and apply them to the German situation. France mobilized some 6,000,000 men, but not less than 2,000,000, a good third, may be deducted for service outside the battlefront, leaving the French an available active and reserve strength of 4,000,000. On the same basis Germany mobilized about 9,000,000, and put actually under arms or in reserve for active service between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000. If the French have lost 2,400,000 out of 4,000,000, then the Germans have lost not less than 4,200,000 of 7,000,000. If the French have only 1,600,000 left, the Germans have not more than 2,800,000, assuming that both have lost at the same ratio.

As to this last point there may be some dispute. Conceivably the French loss has been slightly higher proportionately than the German. But the Germans have been steadily fighting, while the French have had considerable periods of tranquillity while the Germans were engaged with the Russians, the Serbians and the British. We may say with absolute fairness that if the French have lost 2,400,000 out of 4,000,000 the Germans have lost not less than 4,000,000 out of 7,000,000, the figures representing permanent loss in both cases.

Now, it is certain that the Germans have still more than 3,000,000 in the field and in immediate reserve, because it requires not less than this figure to man their lines, and they still have some reserves. They have thus obviously taken their own ratio of loss and somewhat exaggerated it to use as the French ratio. But have they exaggerated it by much?

Hilaire Belloc, who has laid much stress upon the attrition detail, has insisted for a long time that the German permanent loss exceeds 3,000,000 and probably passes 3,250,000. In that case, as he has maintained, the Germans have—allowing 3,000,000 for their field armies, which is too little—under 750,000 left as reserve. He has pointed out also that the German loss may reach to 4,000,000, which would mean that it had been at the same ratio as the Germans now adopt for French losses.

We have, then, interesting if inconclusive data furnished by German figures. If the French losses and the German are approximately equal, and everything points to this, both countries are approaching the exhaustion of all reserves *pari passu*. The French assert that the Germans have reached the point already and fix the German permanent loss at around 4,000,000. The Germans assert that the French have passed the point and fix the French losses at 2,400,000. We have substantial agreement on the ratio from both sides, in each case applied to the enemy.

We may conclude that both the French and the Germans have exaggerated, but to about the same degree. We may assume that the French still have at least 2,000,000 men available and the Germans around 3,500,000. One may expand either figure slightly as he chooses to estimate the ratio of German or French losses as greater, but there is no basis for any great expansion. Both have lost at about the same rate.

If Germany has only 3,500,000 men left, or 3,750,000 at the most, her actual reserve is not much above 500,000, allowing for the number needed to hold the lines. The French, however, are helped by the fact that the British are steadily increasing their army in France and have now taken over the line practically from the sea to the Somme. Every time the British take over a portion of the line the French reserve is increased, although, of course, the actual numbers remain the same.

France has now about 1,600,000 troops in line, accepting the German figures, but she has not less than 400,000 in reserve, if Germany has any reserves left. Probably the British will take over the sector between the Oise and the Somme before the year is over and release one more French army. Suppose that the French and Germans both lose at approximately the same rate for two months more. Then the French will have no reserves if their loss is 400,000; the Germans none if their loss is much above 250,000. They will then have to shorten their lines, and this is what all those who have talked about attrition have always insisted.

Germany's present bid for peace is an interesting document, viewed alongside her estimate of French losses. There is no mistaking the fact that her estimate will give new strength to the argument of those who have believed that Germany was approaching the point where her reserves would be exhausted, and there is sound reason for believing that Germany will not be able to hold her present lines for six months more if the wastage is anything like the average for the past months of the war.

An Example for Mr. Whitman.

Mayor Mitchel's plea to Governor Whitman for economy in state affairs would not come with half so much emphasis if his administration of New York City's affairs had not shown the way. It is true, as he says, that real estate here is taxed to such a point that further increase in the tax rate will precipitate disaster for the smaller owners. That is not his fault. In his administration the city's administrative expenses have been reduced $3,125,000 below what they were in 1914, and a sound financial policy has been adopted which in a decade or two will relieve the city of large interest payments.

Governor Whitman's administration has not been similarly successful as to financial affairs. He insisted on a direct state tax last year—ostensibly to pay for deficiencies left over from the Glynn administration—and subsequent events proved, as was pointed out by The Tribune, that that tax was unnecessary. Now, with no deficiencies from his own first year of office to make up, he is talking about being able to cut only about $1,000,000 from a total of appropriations equalling last year's, which was supposed to contain $10,000,000 liabilities inherited from Governor Glynn.

New York City naturally will hold rather with Mayor Mitchel when he urges the Governor to veto $14,000,000 appropriations as unnecessary than with the Governor, who thinks he can save the taxpayers only $1,000,000. The one has made good in handling the public funds; the other has been notably unsuccessful. Governor Whitman has a chance to redeem himself, if he has the courage to cut out political items and force economy on departments always eager to grab appropriations from an easy Legislature. If the Governor will run the state's affairs as well as the fusion administration has handled the city's, the state at large will be grateful, and there will be no apprehension here of another direct state tax next year.

Since Nora Slammed the Door.

An elderly poet of some fifty-one years sat down at Christiania in the year 1879 to write his first play. At the end of Act III his heroine, Nora by name, marched out of her doll's house with banners waving and slammed the door. Behind the door she left a husband, whose sole fault, calmly considered, was in being what he was supposed to be, a husband. That is to say, he called his wife his "little twittering lark," his "little squirrel," his "little featherhead," welcomed what he regarded as her inability to think, and in so many words urged her to "lean on me." "I should not be a man," he explained, "if this womanly helplessness did not just give you a double attractiveness in my eyes." So she slammed the door and took to the open air.

Such an utter husband may have been even then a shade old-fashioned among the advanced styles of Norway. But plenty of husbands in and out of Christiania arose to shout their disapproval. The Torvalds of real life emptied derision and worse on the old yet ever young head of Henrik Ibsen. And it was only an exceptional woman in the world about that saw anything more in Nora than a selfish little cat, with no more sense than to throw up a perfectly good job as a wife for the absurd pleasure of proclaiming her creed: "I believe that before all else I am a reasonable human being, just as you are—or, at all events, that I must try and become one."

That was thirty-seven years ago. The Torvalds have not passed away, by any means. They still exist in profusion—perhaps a little less puffed out in the chest, a good deal more addicted to persuasion. But essentially the same. An especially choice specimen comes to mind from recent fiction, Edward, husband to a heroine of Mr. George's creation, in "The Second Blooming." He called her his "Gracy-Bracy," with other baby talk to fit, and, as we recall, was wont to pinch her ear amorously. So she took the only course open to her as the heroine of a modern English novel and ran quite a life of it until her second blooms faded and it became time to return to Edward.

There are undoubtedly many American Edwards left. Yet as a type we seem to recognize a greater prevalency for a significant hero named Henry W. Henry, who appears all too infrequently in dialogue form upon the pages of "The New Republic." He has a wife, Edna, who is plainly a descendant of Nora; and two children. Henry has discarded the playfulness that was wont to cheer the heart of Torvald. He is rather lugubrious—a rooster with his wings clipped, to revert to primitive metaphor. But he struts along over the same old route, flaunting his traditional omniscience as a last hope in a woman-ridden world. Edna kisses him on the forehead, punctures his fine theory with an obvious, particular instance, and goes singing on her cheerful, independent way. She is more of a mother to her absurd Henry than anything else—a modern mother, that is, kind and firm, but not disposed to spoil.

Which strikes us as an excellent spot upon which to leave the independent female who slammed the door of her doll's house in 1879. She has apparently returned home, bringing some wisdom with her. And she is still a woman—quite as unmistakably a woman as ever. Actually, the open air has done her good.

Gouging the Coal Consumer.

Evidently Attorney General Gregory is as suspicious of the coal mining companies as the users of coal are. His advice to the Federal Trade Commission to begin an investigation into operating costs and profits at once, if the companies raise prices to consumers following the raise in miners' wages just sanctioned, is justified by the past performances he cites. The operators have made the public pay not only the full wage increase to the workers, but an additional profit over the increased cost of production which, since the 1912 readjustment of wages, has been estimated at $12,000,000 a year. Then an increase in wages amounting to 9 cents a ton was followed by an increase in coal prices of 25 cents a ton.

The public is educated to the fact that it must pay the cost of production on any article it buys and a reasonable profit for the capital invested in the industry. In the production cost the American people are willing to have figured good living wages, rising as living costs rise. But there is an inevitable, and natural, prejudice against being gouged by capitalists in any industry who raise prices considerably over what they raise wages, and then charge the total increase to the higher rate of pay for the workers. It ought to dawn on the coal producers that they have done that about often enough—that the public recognizes the trick and classes it with the shell-and-pea game.

Attorney General Gregory's vigilance is right and proper. If the old trick be tried again—and there has been plenty of preliminary warning—it would be excellent for governmental agencies to exercise their powers to dissuade the coal barons from further profit-gathering along that line.

Conscience and Intellect.

The slacker at all costs is at present meeting with many difficulties in England. The use of conscience has been limited in practice by the High Court. A man may object on religious grounds to combatant service, but not, it seems, to military service in the broadest sense.

Some time ago a very scrupulous youth, who could not find it in his heart to kill, was assigned to ambulance work. When he had been at it for a while his conscience grew too strong for him, and he decided that saving lives on the battlefield was not much better than taking them. Nothing that had anything to do with making war could by any means be countenanced by him; so he asked for exemption.

He had some difficulty in making the judges understand the delicacy of his scruples, for upon inquiry it was learned that he was not too conscientious or too proud to be dependent on his father, who was managing director of a factory given over to the production of munitions of war. When the inconsistency of his conscience was presented to him as clearly as possible he made no attempt to deny it, but pleaded that a very fine conscience was perfectly 'compatible with considerable stupidity.

The argument was impressive, but the court apparently came to the conclusion that his intellectuals were sufficient to enable him to be of some service to his country in a military way.

A Voice of Patriotic Americanism.

(From an Editorial in The New York Times.)

Deserted by their Representative in Congress, the Americans of his district must be eager to hear a voice of patriotic Americanism, of a man who can speak with authority on the great national duty which Mr. Hay will not have done, a man who, whatever his political ambitions or vagaries, can rise, as he did at Chicago, far above political intentions and, profoundly moved by the peril of his country and the blindness of too many of his countrymen, utter to Americans the undying Americanism which the politicasters are trying to strangle. If the Americans in the ten unfortunate counties will write to Oyster Bay, they will get an answer worth hearing; and the man who will make it will be at home in the district of Daniel Morgan and George Rogers Clarke.

Cock Robin—1916.

Who killed the Party?
"I," said T. R——t.
"Just to be smarty
"I killed the Party."

Who saw it die?
"I," said the nation,
"In great perturbation,
"I saw it die."

Who tolled the bell?
"I," said the Moose
"Without any excuse,
"I tolled the bell."

Who'll bring it back?
"I," said C. Hughes,
"I can *if I choose*—
"I'll bring it back."

ELLEN K. HOOKER.

TWO DATES

With a Hope That Americans Will Not Fail to Remember Them.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There are two dates of national importance this year. They stand equal distances from each other. The first brings to mind the second and the second will bring to mind the first. They are indelible in the brain of every American.

May 7.
November 7.

May the latter help compensate the former.

AN AMERICAN.

Dunkirk, N. Y., May 8, 1916.

Patience That Killed.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In President Wilson's last note to the German government occurs a rather significant and illuminating paragraph. It is the following: "Throughout the months since the imperial government announced on February 4, 1915, its submarine policy, now happily abandoned, the government of the United States has been constantly guided and restrained by motives of friendship in its patient efforts to bring to an amicable settlement the critical questions arising from that policy." I venture to say that not a few Americans citizens, not because they love their President less, but because they love their country more, very much wish that motives of justice and regard for the rights of American citizens and the honor of his country had guided and constrained the President's dealings with the German government since February 4, 1915. The President cannot be under the illusion that his patient efforts under the sway of motives of friendship have borne any other fruit than the continuance of that iniquitous and frightful policy so coolly and defiantly announced on February 4, 1915. If that policy is indeed now abandoned, can President Wilson for a moment believe that his persistent friendly sentiments, patient waiting and much persuasion have brought this happy issue out of our troubles?

Suppose the same unequivocal and stern alternative which we have recently presented to the German government had been set before that government in February, 1915. Is there much reason to doubt that the choice made by the German government would have been the same it has now made?

One may say all this is useless and ungracious harking back and only an enemy would be saying such things. That might be so did not history have the trick of repeating itself and if a voter looking to next November did not need to let the lamp of experience shine a bit upon his way.

JOHN E. RUSSELL.

New York, May 10, 1916.

Diction in Behalf of Mr. Brandeis.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The letter of the President to Senator Culberson, the avowed purpose of which is "to make clear his reasons" for seeking to force the confirmation of his nominee for the Supreme Court of the United States upon the Senate (the questionable taste of which proceeding we may refrain from commenting on), is conspicuous as usual for its verbal felicity and fecundity and chaste diction, and is further conspicuous for the absence of any such reason other than the individual and personal opinion of Dr. Woodrow Wilson himself. In the course of the thousand and more words which compose the letter no tangible authority is cited in support of this opinion. Boiled down, it amounts simply to this: Mr. Brandeis is the best man for the place because I think he is the best man.

Now, could not both time and rhetorical effort have been greatly economized and the same idea have been more tersely as well as more sweetly conveyed in the words of the erstwhile popular refrain:

"If you ask the reason,
Words are all too few,
For I simply love you, dear,
Because you're you."

GEORGE WESTERVELT.

New York, May 9, 1916.

He Has Been Kissed.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am sorry to have to correct your hitherto accurate paper, but in the edition of May 8 I find my name included in a list of Columbia University seniors who have never been kissed. Now, newspaper reporters, like the rest of us, are liable to error, and by the doctrine of universal fallibility may be pardoned for most of the same, but this flight of fancy is too much, by several flights.

I take the liberty, therefore, of addressing these few lines to you in the hope that they may counteract any fallacious ideas arising in the minds of my female acquaintances after a perusal of your article of May 9, and in order that no young lady whom I may have the carelessness to kiss at some future date shall think she may exercise the rights of "squatter sovereignty" over the process. Also, in the hope that any female or group of females who may have considered descending en masse upon our fair university and destroying the barrier between those narrow-minded seniors and the normal outside world may be disillusionized of any impression of novelty in my case. ARTHUR S. CRANE.

New York, May 9, 1916.

Mayor Mitchel's Non-Partisanship.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: You published a good report and editorial on Mayor Mitchel's address to the Committee of 107 on May 2. It is an excellent idea for our Mayor to make an annual accounting, and I hope he will repeat the performance next year.

The Mayor seems to have been non-partisan in the proceedings of the Board of Estimate, but he forgot the wishes of the Republicans and independents who voted for him when he supported Governor Glynn for reelection.

As an old Republican who did what he could to elect Mayor Mitchel, I warn him tarough your columns to take no part in the Presidential election this year. If he does, many will say: "This young man cannot be trusted to be non-partisan in a political campaign."

Strictly speaking, it is none of our Mayor's business whom the President appoints as postmaster. The Mayor has enough to do without mixing in Federal patronage or national problems.

Mayor Mitchel should take good care of himself during the coming twenty months.

A FUSIONIST FREEHOLDER.

New York, May 5, 1916.

At Last a Victory.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am unalterably pro-Ally and pro-English in this war, and I, therefore, cannot refrain from registering my indignation in connection with your recent article entitled "British Failure," when you must admit that the British army has won one great victory during the last twenty-one months—namely, that of the defeat of the little handful of Sinn Fein uprisers in Dublin recently.

MATTHEW F. BARRETT.

New York, May 10, 1916.

Shorter Catechism.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The suppression of the Lusitania memorial meeting by Mayor Mitchel is the worst disgrace America has suffered. Why is The Tribune silent? Are you gagged, too?

REGINALD.

Hamilton, Mass., May 9, 1916.

[No.—Ed.]

"THE LORD WILL PROVIDE."

THE WITTENBERG CAMP

Testimony of a Correspondent Cited to Controvert Charges of Neglect.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In The Tribune of May 8 another instalment of the British story is given charging the administration of the prison camp at Wittenberg, Germany, with criminal neglect of the prisoners' welfare. I recall that most of these charges have been answered by anticipation in The Tribune of April 22 in a letter to the editor signed K. M. M. It is significant that the author of this new "typhus story" is obliged to admit at the end of his narrative that the German authorities have made provisions "which reduce the chance of another outbreak to a minimum."

There is, however, still other neutral American evidence, proving, at least, that actual conditions in the much abused prison camp are normal and afford no basis for complaints.

In "The Chicago Tribune" of May 7, 1916, Mr. James O'Donnell Bennett, war correspondent of that paper, relates his experiences in the prison camp in an article dated Wittenberg, April 7. He tells of the routine life in the little town crowded with soldiers and 16,000 prisoners. He has apparently investigated the conditions under which the prisoners live, yet he has nothing unsatisfactory to report. The British portion of the prisoners must be very small, though they have been the only ones to complain, because Mr. Bennett does not even mention them. He talks, however, of the "cheerful faces of the Russian prisoners." He depicts them as "stocky, broad-faced men, without the grace and stateliness of bearing of their officers; and they look up with cheerful grins whenever a passenger train rumbles by them."

While the English alarmists have pictured the German guards as hardly better than cattle drivers who used death as "the only penalty for any infraction of the rules," this American correspondent from his personal experience has a wholly different view of the relations between prisoners and guards. "There is no evidence of rancor between the prisoners and their captors," is his unqualified statement, and elsewhere he says that he can nowhere "discover any signs of the rigors of war."

In the face of such statements coming from such a source one is certainly justified in accepting the new edition of German atrocities with great reserve. "Greatly exaggerated" has become a stigma not only of British press stories, but also of many official English reports.

DR. R. J. OBERFOHREN.

New York, May 9, 1916.

How to Prepare for a Parade.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In the interest of the health of many people who are expecting to take part in the preparedness parade on Saturday next, will you be good enough, in a prominent place in your paper, to call attention to the following matters which may be the means of preventing serious illness, and in some cases even death, of some of the marchers?

No civilian parade ever starts on time, so that every subdivision, with hardly an exception, is obliged to wait often for hours in the street until the proper moment has arrived for it to fall in behind and take its allotted position in the parade.

A large proportion of the people who are intending to march on Saturday, especially women, have never taken part in any parade, and their mistake usually is that owing to the exercise which they will be having in this parade, they fail to provide themselves with the necessary wraps or clothing to keep them warm during the long waits in the street. It is this failure to properly provide for the long waits and delays which is the cause of pneumonia and innumerable colds. A wrap or sweater, or even a newspaper, which in the case of men can be easily put under their coats or vests during the wait and later discarded after the parade starts, will be found invaluable.

Another point to be noted is regarding shoes of the marchers, which are more often than otherwise too thin or inappropriate. Everybody should wear easy shoes with heavy soles and low heels, and a proper regard for this requirement added to sufficient wraps to keep them warm during the waits will make the parade a pleasure, whereas otherwise it may be a tragedy as far as some individuals are concerned.

An experience of over twenty years as a member of the national guard of this city prompts me to make this suggestion, and earnestly request that you should, in some appropriate way, bring the matter prominently before the readers of your esteemed paper at your earliest possible opportunity.

EX-NATIONAL GUARDSMAN.

New York, May 9, 1916.

An Accomplice in Crime.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The recent note is a hypocritical and malicious attempt on the part of Germany to force the American people to become their accomplice in crime, and should be absolutely ignored by the United States.

No convincing proof is submitted to show that German women and children have really starved because of the English blockade; nor has Germany, in order to prove her sincerity, withdrawn her conquering hordes from neutral states which she has wantonly violated. We do not know of a single case where murder was wilfully done on defenceless non-combatants by the Allies.

Our right to buy and sell in our own land cannot be disputed. Our ports have been open to the commerce of the world. We have not refused to sell munitions of war to Germany; and to refuse them to the unprepared nations, which are being ruthlessly ravaged by the frightful German military murdering machine purely out of sympathy with the German cause would be a decidedly depraved act on our part. LONGWORTH GREEN.

New York, May 5, 1916.

Hats Off to the Flag.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have noticed, on viewing various parades, that there is a marked lack of respect shown to the national flag as it passes on review. A very small minority honor the flag by taking off their hats as it passes by.

I attribute this negligence rather to ignorance than to disrespect. Would it not be compatible along with the other patriotic movements of the day, and in lieu of the coming preparedness parade, to educate the public through your columns on this point? We might see more deference paid to the colors next Saturday.

I sincerely hope you may consider this a patriotic movement worthy of adoption.

J. W. SNOWDEN.

New York, May 9, 1916.

The Making of Republicans.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I met an acquaintance the other day who was formerly for several years a member of the National Guard of the State of New York. I asked him what he thought of the idea of depending upon the militia for defence in case of invasion.

To use his vigorous expression, "It is all rot. You can't get them to drill. Half of them don't know enough to sight a gun or fix a bayonet. I know, for I have drilled them."

Then he said, "I'm an old line Democrat, but while I would like to vote for Roosevelt I'll vote for a yellow dog, if necessary, on the Republican ticket. Wilson is making Republicans so fast you can't count them."

New York, May 8, 1916. M. T. R.

A Crawfish Paper.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: "President Wilson has sent another note to Germany."

He has—a note that no American, placing country above party, could criticise justly, but a note that a crawfish paper, placing party above country, naturally would attempt to refer to scathingly.

W. B. DESPARD.

Brooklyn, May 9, 1916.

"The Anniversary."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to compliment you on your grand editorial of Sunday, "The Anniversary," which is worthy of preservation with Lincoln's speeches and Tilden's warning on preparedness.

I wish that you could devise some way in which it could be sent all over the country in pamphlet form. A. K. SHIPMAN,

Member American Legion.

Bridgeport, Conn., May 8, 1916.

A PLEA FOR UNION

Republicans and Progressives Should Join Hands to Rescue the Nation.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: As the time for holding the Republican convention approaches the more important appears the responsibility that will rest upon the delegates selected to attend it.

Four years ago, out of incidents that never should have arisen, was born a new party, conceived in passion, representing no seasoned agitation, and resting upon no great exigency.

Upon what may be designated as the basic features of organized democracy, no fundamental differences existed between the Republican party and this new born attribute, and it can be said in all truth that collectively they had the numerical backing of the citizenship of the country on every important and vital question that concerned either the domestic or foreign policies of this republic.

The consequences of this lamentable political blunder have caused the United States, under the withering dominion of a party whipped into a not altogether pleased acquiesence by its recognized head, to sink self-respect and forfeit the esteem formerly entertained by alien governments, including our unfortunate tropical neighbor across the Rio Grande.

Designedly that wing of the Republican party for the last four years known as Progressive has called its convention to be held at a time contemporaneous with the Republican convention.

There should be held but one nominating convention in Chicago, for the very cogent reason that the Republican party and the so-called Progressive party have but one real adversary, the Democratic party, whose attempts to justify the expectations of its adherents and the hopes of its opponents in dealing with the many perplexing problems that have confronted the Administration have degenerated into a painful exhibition of incompetency and weakness.

The restoration of the domestic affairs of the country to a condition of economic stability, and the placing of our foreign relations upon a basis of at least passing respect not only call for but demand the effort of every citizen who places the dignity and welfare of his country above party expediency.

In mechanics there is a device attached to steam engines called a governor, the object of which is to prevent the engine from racing.

The Progressive party may have performed service in becoming the governor to the Republican party. If so, its service to the country as a separate and distinct entity is over, and reliance should again be placed in the Republican party, as, since the birth of parties, every administration has written its own history in legislation best calculated to promote good government.

Moreover, the public are not interested in past differences or present discussions proceeding from the factional strife of a family quarrel, and it is of no consequence to the great army of supporters of Republican principles whether those differences are really deep seated or represent merely the acrimonious vaporings of party leaders. The problem now is whether this republic shall be represented by a real American or by a man who has publicly stated that his judgment are assisted by the comments of an alien press, and who in the last eighteen months has "boxed the compass" on every important question that has forced his opinion.

Many sections of the country coincide with the recently expressed editorial view of The New York Tribune, that Theodore Roosevelt is that man, even while confessing that a more natural choice would lie elsewhere, a high order of patriotic purpose.

In balancing the claims and availability of candidates, delegates should see to it that the choice falls upon, first, a thoroughbred American; second, a man of Presidential capacity; third, of magnetic and forceful personality; and finally, a candidate able to lead the fight against Democratic incompetency, in massed formation to victory, for the impending conflict will not be trench warfare.

FRED D. STANLEY.

Alamosa, Col., May 3, 1916.